



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,045	06/29/2006	Konrad Rociingh	HM-729PCT	2579
40570	7590	07/10/2009	EXAMINER	
FRIEDRICH KUEFFNER 317 MADISON AVENUE, SUITE 910 NEW YORK, NY 10017			PATEL, VISHAL A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
			3676	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
			07/10/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/585,045	ROEINGH ET AL.
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Vishal Patel	3676	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Newly submitted claim 6 is directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Claim 6 is directed to a process, which was not the originally filed invention.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 6 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

This election/restriction is made final

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robotham (US. 6,375,195).

Robotham clearly discloses all the limitations of claims 1 and 4-5. For example a device having a sealing ring (e.g. 6), roll neck or roll bush (e.g. 4), a holder (e.g. 14) having elastic sealing elements (e.g. 13a-13b), the sealing elements are supported by the body 13 or springs in the sealing elements and a chock (e.g. 9). The sealing ring (e.g. 6) having a sealing surface that is a coated with metal (e.g. column 2, lines 65-68). The sealing ring is fastened to the roll neck

(e.g. column 2, lines 63-65, the sealing ring is fastened since it rotates on the roll neck after being mounted on the roll neck). Furthermore the member 5 prevents the sealing ring from moving axially.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robotham in view of Draskovich et al (e.g. 5,544,897).

Robotham disclose the invention substantially as claimed above but fail to disclose that the sealing surface is nitrided (particular process of nitriding is considered to be method limitation and given little patentable weight in an apparatus claim particular a nitrided coating is taught). Draskovich discloses a device having a sealing element (e.g. 22) contacting a sealing ring (e.g. 32) that has a coating of nitrided (e.g. 42). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have the metal coating (e.g. chrome coating) Robotham to be replaced by a nitrided coating as taught by Draskovich, since having one metal coating replaced by another is considered to be art equivalent (column 3, lines 4-5 of Draskovich).

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robotham in view of Yoshida (US. 7,063,193).

Robotham discloses the invention substantially as claimed above but fails to disclose that the coating is an oxidized coating. Yoshida discloses a sealing element (e.g. 127c) that contact a sealing surface that is coated with an oxidized coating (figure 7, sealing surface 200 having an oxidized coating, column 15, lines 29-47). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have the coating or Robotham to be replaced by an oxidized coating as taught by Yoshida, to provide a sealing surface that has anti-wearing property, corrosion resistance property and heat-resistance property (column 15, lines 40-41 of Yoshida).

*Response to Arguments*

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/14/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' argument that the sealing ring of Robotham is not fastened to the roll neck or the neck bush is not persuasive because Robotham teaches in column 2, lines 63-65. Furthermore Robotham teaches that the sealing assembly 1 mounted on the rotatable roll neck 2 comprises a first bearing element, the first bearing element comprises sleeve 5 and moulded seal carrier ring 6, the moulded seal carrier ring 6 is mounted on the tapered section 3 of roll neck 2 and is adapted to provide a horizontal running sleeve 7 for flexible seal element 13 and the outer flange of the moulded seal carrier ring 6 is provided with a garter spring 8 in a conventional manner (e.g. well known that the garter spring 8 on the seal carrier ring fastens the carrier ring 6 on the roll neck).

Furthermore evidence is provided by references 4,099,731 or 4,234,196 or 4,455,856 or 4,586,720 or 4,866,827. Particular evidence is shown that a seal carrier is fastened to a roll neck by reference 4,099,731, column 65, lines 65-68.

Applicants' argument that Robotham fails to disclose a rolled sealing surface is not persuasive because the surface 7 is the rolled sealing surface (e.g. the surface 7 is horizontal and annular form).

***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vishal Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-7060. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am to 8:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jennifer H. Gay can be reached on 571-272-7029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/V. P./  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3676

/Vishal Patel/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3676